eriod of limitation prescribed by the Section for institution of suits in Civil Courts pplies only to cases where the sale of property was admittedly had for arrears of evenue *really* and *in fact* due, and not to cases where the aggrieved party alleges his plaint that there were no arrears of revenue. In the latter cases, it is stated at the period of limitation is that prescribed in the Limitation Regulation. The wording of the Section, therefore, if allowed to stand as it is, would seriously affect the operation of the Revenue Recovery Regulation. The object of the Section is two-fold, *viz.*, (1) to give the aggrieved party a redress by a full and regular trial in a civil suit, and (2) to secure the title of the auction purchaser to the property, by limiting the period to six months, during which title to the property purchased shall remain unsettled and subject to question by the institution of a civil suit. In the light of the construction put upon the present Section, the second of the two objects cannot be duly fulfilled. For, it frequently happens that a suit for setting aside an auction sale held under the Revenue Recovery Regulation, is based on the ground that arrears of revenue for which the auction sale was held did not really exist. In such cases, under the present ruling, it is open to the aggrieved party to bring his suit within the statutory period prescribed in the Limitation Regulation, *viz*, twelve years— too long a time for any purchaser to wait. This will, to my mind, have a deterrent effect upon intending purchasers in revenue auction, and will eventually affect not only revenue sales but also the owners of the properties, in as much as they are not likely to obtain good or even fair prices for their properties, and lastly, it is very likely to encourage speculation in litigation. The amendment proposed, which is quite harmless in itself, will prove an effective remedy. For these reasons, I beg to move for the principle of the Bill being affirmed.

Seconded by Mr. Raman Pillai.

Carried.

Mr. Ananda Row then proposed that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, consisting of Mr. Vieyra, Mr. Kesava Pillai and the Mover, to report within ne month.

Seconded by Mr. Sri. Narayanan Tampi.

Carried.

THE COURT FEES BILL.

In view of the importance of the measure, the general sense of the meeting as that the Bill should be referred back to a Select Committee.

Resolved accordingly that the Bill be recommitted to a Select Committee, onsisting of Mr. Krishnan Nair, Mr. Kesava Pillai and the Mover, to report within ree months.

CIVIL PROCEDURE CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. Ananda Row.—Sir, before the Council takes up the next item of business in the agenda, I beg permission to introduce a Bill to amend the Civil Procedure Code. The amendment proposed does not affect any main principle of law and only aims at greater convenience in the disposal of work. It is an amendment which will bring our Code in consonance with the British Indian Civil Procedure Code, in the matter of writing judgments. As the Bill is but a simple measure, I beg to move, under Section 66 of the Legislative Council Rules, that the operation of the said Rules be suspended, so that the Bill may go through all the stages—except final reading—at this Meeting.

Second by Mr. Vieyra.

Carried.

Mr. Ananda Row.—I propose that the Bill be read again on a future day of which notice shall be given.

Seconded by Mr. Subrahmania Iyer.

Carried.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly